

We are not talking about peanuts. Forty billion dollars is a lot of money, and what happens if Mexico defaults on these loans? What assurances do we have that we are protected by their oil reserves or any other kind of collateral? Forty billion dollars—that could be used to control crime, offset the shortfall in defense, make our streets safer, immunize our children, and make job training and continuing education available for more Americans.

CHANGING BUSINESS AS USUAL— PUTTING AN END TO UNFUNDED MANDATES

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, we were elected to represent the people of our districts, and that means changing business as usual. Changing business as usual means no more unfunded mandates.

Every community in America is suffering at the hands of Congress. Currently, State and local governments must comply with 185 Federal mandates. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, in 1993 alone more than 150 new mandates were introduced in Congress.

How can a community that spends approximately 13 percent of its revenue on these mandates afford to finance everyday priorities? Communities are being forced to postpone public safety programs and programs for children and senior citizens. They have reached their limit and have started fighting back. Some are even challenging Congress' authority to impose these mandates, and others are simply refusing to comply.

Mr. Speaker, let us join the fight and pass the unfunded mandate reform legislation for the good of our country.

A PLEA FOR REAL CHANGE, NOT FAKE CHANGES

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago the President had the courage to talk about real change—not the fake, pretend change that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been promoting.

The American people did not send us here for fake change, and the American people cannot be fooled. They sent us here because they want a Government that understands their problems and is working to make their lives better. They want a House of Representatives that is not afraid to improve the way it does business so that it can improve the way it does the people's business.

Real change means altering the way campaigns are financed, the way we deal with lobbyists, the ethics laws that govern us, and the free gifts and perks we are allowed to take.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk from the other side of the aisle about change but not a word about these changes, real changes. This institution can be judged by answering a simple question: Will we provide a government that is ruled by Americans with extraordinary influence of a government that is influenced by ordinary Americans? The answer so far is not very promising.

□ 1130

KEEPING THE PROMISE

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, last week we brought to the floor and passed the balanced budget amendment. In doing so, we kept our promise with the American people throughout our Contract With America. We took that giant first step and passed what the American people have been demanding for years—for Congress to get its financial affairs in order.

I am proud to be a part of the bipartisan team that pulled together to pass the balanced budget amendment. And I look forward to continuing in this bipartisan fashion to pass the rest of the Republican's Contract With America.

This week we will be voting on the unfunded mandates bill. Through this bill, we are going to stop putting intolerable burdens on State and local governments and the private sector. I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation and keeping the promise with the people.

RESTORING PUBLIC'S TRUST IN THE HOUSE

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in strong support of House Resolution 40, which seeks to ban gifts to Members and staff from lobbyists and lobbying firms. This legislation will ban all meals, entertainment, travel, legal defense fund contributions, and other gifts. It also seeks to ban House Members from accepting any royalties for any published work.

In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton stated that we do not need a law for everything and challenged Members to take it upon themselves not to accept any gifts from lobbyists.

For my part, I have decided to take the President up on his challenge and will follow the lobbyist gift ban. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will follow suit.

Let us begin anew, and work to restore the people's trust in this House. This legislation is a strong first step.

FEDERAL MANDATES PRICE TAG

(Mr. CREMEANS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CREMEANS. Mr. Speaker, last night was a very long night, and I have three words for my colleagues in the 104th Congress, and that is, Mr. Speaker: "Stop the insanity." Stop sending State and local governments insane Federal mandates with insane price tags. For over the last 9 years, Congress has imposed over 72 unfunded, burdensome mandates to the States. In the 16 years preceding that, only 19 of these oppressive mandates were passed.

Mr. Speaker, this is a disturbing trend. The Federal Government is increasing its demands on the States while actually sending them less money. In fact, the Federal aid to State governments has decreased by \$27.2 billion in the last decade. For the past 40 years, Congress has forced States to pay for the Federal Government's mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop passing the buck. Let us stop the insanity.

DEMISE OF THE BAILOUT?

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this morning we learned that the Clinton administration and Republican leadership here in Congress have abandoned their plan to seek congressional approval of \$40 billion in loan guarantees to Mexico. Workers and taxpayers of America prevailed in our first round of debate over the proposed Mexican bailout. But President Clinton is scheduled to reveal an alternative plan when he addresses the Nation's Governors this afternoon.

We should watch carefully to ensure that he defends the American people against Wall Street speculators. At the same time, the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee is meeting right now and is likely to raise your interest rates. That is the seventh time over the past year. What this means to you is that if you bought a \$60,000 home a year ago on a 30-year mortgage, your payments today will be about \$100 higher than they were a year ago.

Now, why are interest rates rising when inflation has not gone up and your wages have not gone up? The reason is because the markets have discounted the cost of the \$40 billion bailout, and more, that is related to NAFTA and Mexico.

Too much hot money from Wall Street was bet on a gamble in Mexico that we are all having to pay for now.

SUPPORT LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. BLUTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, last week Congress overwhelmingly passed the balanced budget amendment which began a 7-year journey toward a constitutional requirement of matching receipts with outlays. However, there will be potholes along the way in the form of congressional pork-barrel spending. That is why we need to give the President of the United States the line-item veto authority.

For too long the President has been faced with the Hobson's choice of signing an appropriation act along with all the pork, or shutting down vital Government services. H.R. 2, introduced by Chairman WILLIAM CLINGER and co-sponsored by 160 of our colleagues, would make Congress more accountable for its spending by giving the President the ability to delete or reduce specific spending items.

When the President sends a package of rescissions to Congress, the light of public scrutiny will be on the Congress to either accept them or fight them. If Congress chooses to disapprove of the rescissions, it will be in the position of defending indefensible spending, and the voters will be listening. It is about accountability. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2, the Line-Item Veto Act.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT WON'T BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night this House passed a balanced budget amendment, and ever since then we have seen Members getting up here beating their chest and chanting about how wonderful that is. We had one Member on the other side, a colleague of mine, get up last Friday during these same 1-minute speeches and say we fixed the flaw in the Constitution. We took a giant step forward.

Yet the same day, his party in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee marked up a defense supplemental that had \$1.8 billion in new debt that is not offset. So we talk about balancing the budget, we even pass an amendment. It is a magic pill. It is supposed to work. But the next day we add almost \$2 billion new debt, because we cannot really vote for it when it comes to the details.

We have talked for 2 years in here. We have heard the Republican side say cut spending first, cut spending first. Now they have got the chance to do it, and there are all kinds of excuses. They cannot vote to cut specific spending. They are like Wimpy in the Popeye cartoons. They will gladly pay us Tuesday for a hamburger today.

I say we have had enough borrow and spend, borrow and spend, borrow and spend, and the vote last Thursday night did not balance the budget.

ON THE MEXICAN LOAN GUARANTEES

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, last week I came here to the House floor to give a 1-minute on the concerns of my constituents regarding the proposed Mexican loan guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, only minutes later, a fax from a concerned citizen who saw me on the floor was waiting on my desk. This person does not live in my district. He is from all of the way across the Nation in Henderson, NV. But his words rang familiar to those of people in my district.

Mr. Speaker, the message was, "America is not made up of, nor successful as a nation because of elitists or CEOs. America is successful because of those willing to put their heart and soul as well as their backs into the very creation of America."

Mr. Speaker, he continued to admonish that, "Passing bills, arguing opinion, stating your support and even wishing does not get the wall painted, one must pick up a brush and take the risk of getting paint on their hands to get the job done."

Mr. Speaker, this message is not unlike what your constituents are telling you. Let us rise above the morass of petty partisanship that cripples this body and threatens to cripple this Nation, and move forward with positive legislation that impacts the lives of our people.

PERMITTING COMMITTEE CHAIR- MEN TO SCHEDULE HEARINGS

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 43 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 43

Resolved, That, in rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, clause 2(g)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The chairman of each committee of the House (except the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the chairman of the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this subparagraph shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems."

□ 1140

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], for

the purposes of debate only. All time yielded will be for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 43 amends clause 2(g)(3) of House rule 11 to restore by rule what has been the standard operating procedure around here ever since I can remember, and that is to permit committee chairmen to schedule hearings.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a question arose as to the literal meaning of the rule which states that a committee, I repeat, a committee shall call hearings at least a week in advance unless the committee for good cause determines that such should be called sooner.

The Parliamentarian's office confirmed that the term "committee" means just that. The committee acting collectively.

As a result of the point of order raised against a particular hearing that was overruled by a committee chairman in the committee, the Committee on Rules had to recommend to the House a waiver of the rule in order to bring a measure to the floor of the House last week.

Had we not done so, a legitimate point of order could have been raised in the House against the consideration of that measure.

Mr. Speaker, because of this interpretation every committee of this House was naturally thrown into a state of uncertainty as to the fate of its hearing and its bills. Consequently, the Committee on Rules was asked to look into the matter and resolve it as soon as possible.

Last Monday I introduced House Resolution 43 to substitute the word "chairman" for the word "committee" in that rule, as the party responsible for calling hearings.

The Committee on Rules met and reported the resolution on Thursday by voice vote with no amendments offered.

At that time, I was led to believe that was not a controversial issue and that everyone agreed there was a need to legally restore what has been the standard operating procedure in this House for many, many years.

However, since not all the bases have been touched by the minority in order to be safe we reported an open rule, should any subsequent concerns or amendments surface.

Mr. Speaker, in my experience such a special rule has never been reported before on a simple rule change such as this which is already privileged for House floor consideration without requiring a special rule. It was not until after we reported that we received letters from some very respected ranking minority Members expressing concern